

Journal.)

SENATOR HALL: Senator Will, on the amendment.

SENATOR WILL: Thank you, Mr. President, and members of the body, this is an amendment that deserves a long discussion. It probably will not get one. What this amendment would do is...would calculate the value of agricultural land at 100 percent of market value for the purposes of distributing LB 1059 monies. This gets back to the issue of exactly what it means when we do decide to value property differently for property tax purposes. We have made a number of decisions in recent years, including the classification of agricultural property, the classification of personal property, the exemption of a number of items of property from the tax rolls. The result is that we have had a substantial burden of the property tax fall upon residential property and I think that there was an acknowledgement of that when the voters decided to vote for the constitutional amendments that have allowed us to classify agricultural property. I don't know that that acknowledgement extends to the area of state aid because that is where it has an impact because we are artificially classifying property at a lower value in certain taxing districts throughout the state. If you decide to base state aid on the level at which property is valued, that boosts state aid to those areas at the expense of other areas of the state resulting in a shift in where state aid dollars are going. And simply that's something that I think ought to be flagged. Somebody ought to talk about it when we're talking about an issue like this. And I've always been a supporter of LB 1059. I believe that there should be more dependence upon state sales and income tax dollars for the support of local school districts, but I happen to believe that when you start distributing those dollars you ought to use a more pure system than the one that we have for assessing local taxes right now. I think it's an equity issue. It's something that ought to be explored fully. Obviously, at this point in the session, this is not something that...it might get a fair amount of debate on it. I know the amendment probably wouldn't go anywhere and I would hope the body would appreciate the fact that I'm going to pull this amendment at this time. But I do want to make the statement that this is a legitimate issue. It's something that ought to be talked about and it's something that I think we should continue to talk about as we examine ways to further reform the system that we have that relies so heavily upon property taxes and perhaps find a better way to maybe